

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC 112 as not enabled by the disclosure. Strangely, the Examiner objected to the amended portions of the specification as new matter but unexplainably did not consider the amendments of the claims wherein "surrounding" was amended to "in communication with". The Applicant is perplexed as the claims as present conform precisely to the specification as originally filed (both description and Figures). Although no detail was provided as to what possible motivation was ascribed to this rejection, the Applicant could only surmise that the possible issue the Examiner may have had was with the term "cover" as opposed to element. As such, that too has been amended. With regard to the term "non-radiolucent" not being enabled by the original disclosure, the Applicant strenuously traverses this assertion. The Examiner is encouraged to re-read paragraph 29 of the specification as originally filed. Again, if this is in regard to the term "cover" that term has been amended. The Applicant has addressed the 112 rejections as best as possible in light of the information presented in the Office Action. The Applicant believes the rejections have been properly addressed, however, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant should the Examiner believe any possible issues have been missed. The Applicant notes that the Examiner, prior to these 112 issues had found the subject matter of these claims allowable.

Claims rejected under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected the pending claims under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Klawitter in view of Wyatt. However, neither of these references teaches the removal of a non-radiolucent heating element automatically prior to image signal generation. The Applicant assumes these limitations were not properly addressed as the Examiner felt they were still subject to an enablement issue. The Applicant respectfully hopes the Examiner can now recognize these are pertinent and enabled limitations that not only meet the enablement requirement but clearly are not taught in either of the cited references either alone or in combination. Reconsideration is formally requested.

Conclusion

Having overcome all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 7-13, and 16-20 are in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance indicating the same is therefore earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 433-7200 if any unresolved matters remain.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas E. Donohue
Reg. No. 44,660
Artz & Artz, P.C.
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500
(248) 223-9522 (Fax)

Dated: February 29, 2008